Reality Against the Symbolic; the Structural Struggle of Humanity and Entropy

Benjamin James

August 13, 2025

The history of human thought can be read as a prolonged oscillation between the generative vitality of reality and the stabilizing, ultimately ossifying structures of the symbolic. In its earliest form, the symbolic emerges as a compression tool. A way to represent, transmit, and coordinate perceptions of the real across individuals and over time. Language, ritual, law, and cultural memory are all products of this compression. Their initial value lies in their ability to preserve coherence, holding together shared maps of the world in the face of fragmentation and forgetfulness. But every compression carries the seed of distortion. Once a symbolic structure is in place, it tends to reinforce its own categories, privileging internal consistency over ongoing contact with the adaptive flux of reality. In time, this self-referential loop becomes an attractor. A domain of stability that resists perturbation not because it is optimally fitted to the real, but because it has become self-sustaining.

This process, which can be called symbolic lock-in, is one of the most pervasive dynamics in human systems. At small scales, it explains how linguistic metaphors harden into unquestioned concepts; at large scales, it explains the persistence of political orders, economic models, and cosmological worldviews long after their functional alignment with reality has decayed. The danger of lock-in is not merely that it produces error, but that it produces a specific kind of error; error with high switching costs. The more a community invests in a symbolic frame, the more costly it becomes to abandon it, even in the face of mounting incoherence. This cost is not only psychological but institutional. Careers, laws, infrastructures, and social bonds all become coupled to the symbolic regime, creating a network of dependencies that punish deviation and reward conformity.

From a structural perspective, the symbolic operates like a high-entropy basin in a complex adaptive landscape. Reality, defined here as the total field of evolving conditions and relationships, is a low-entropy process. It recursively organizes, differentiates, and selects patterns according to their ability to persist in changing environments. The symbolic, by

contrast, is a form of metastable order; it seeks to maintain an existing pattern regardless of environmental shift. While this can provide resilience in the short term, over long durations the divergence between symbolic stability and real-world coherence becomes a vector for collapse. In effect, the symbolic accelerates entropy by suppressing adaptive variation. What appears to be order is, in a deep temporal frame, the erosion of the system's capacity to adapt.

This suggests that humanity's greatest recurrent struggle is not against disorder per se, but against the seductive stability of the symbolic. This is a counterintuitive claim. Most political and philosophical traditions have treated symbols, narratives, and institutions as bulwarks against chaos. In one sense, they are correct. Symbolic systems do prevent short-term collapse by creating shared expectations and reducing coordination costs. But this is a half-truth, because the same symbolic systems that protect against immediate disintegration also lay the groundwork for long-term vulnerability. The symbolic's apparent resistance to entropy masks a deeper coupling to it. By locking the system into a fixed representation of reality, the symbolic ensures that environmental changes will eventually accumulate to the point where the locked-in system can no longer function.

This is not simply a historical pattern; it is a structural inevitability given the properties of representation itself. Every representation is a reduction. No symbolic system can encode the full complexity of the real without collapsing under informational overload. Reduction is necessary, but it comes with the risk that the reduced form will take on an autonomous life; serving its own stability rather than the accuracy of its mapping. In political life, this manifests as the inertia of constitutions, bureaucracies, and party systems. In science, as paradigms that resist anomalous data. In religion, as dogma that persists despite ethical or empirical disconfirmation. In each case, the symbolic was once an adaptive compression, but over time it became an independent attractor.

The lock-in problem is compounded by the fact that humans are not merely users of symbols. We are, in a sense, symbols embodied. Human cognition evolved to rely on abstract representation as a primary mode of environmental engagement. This dependence means that the breakdown of a symbolic order is experienced not only as an external crisis

but as an internal one. To lose the symbols that structure one's reality is to suffer a partial dissolution of the self. The psychic pain of such dissolution produces a strong bias toward preserving the symbolic order at all costs, even in the face of clear evidence that it is misaligned with reality. Thus, the defense of the symbolic becomes self-defense, and adaptation becomes betrayal.

If we widen the lens still further, we can say that this struggle between reality and the symbolic is not uniquely human at all, but a special case of a more general dynamic in complex systems. Any system that develops an internal model of its environment, whether a neural network, a culture, or a biosphere, must balance the stability of that model with its capacity to update in response to change. Too little stability and the system cannot coordinate action; too much stability and the model becomes a liability. In this light, humanity is simply the local embodiment of a universal challenge: to maintain the coupling between representation and the real, resisting the gravitational pull of symbolic self-reinforcement.

The stakes of this struggle are existential. When a symbolic order collapses, the resulting disorientation can be catastrophic, especially if the collapse occurs after a long period of lock-in. The reason is that lock-in erodes not only the accuracy of the symbolic map but also the system's ability to generate new maps. Skills of adaptation atrophy under conditions of high stability; institutions designed for one symbolic regime may be incapable of functioning in another. Collapse then becomes total. Not a controlled shedding of an obsolete frame, but a free-fall into chaos. Historical examples abound, from the fall of empires to the sudden delegitimization of ideological regimes. In each case, the proximate cause may be economic, military, or ecological, but the underlying fragility stems from the same source. The symbolic order had become so decoupled from reality that no smooth transition was possible.

This analysis reframes familiar debates about progress, tradition, and reform. It is not enough to ask whether a given symbolic structure is "true" or "false," "just" or "unjust," in some static sense. The more decisive question is whether the structure maintains an active feedback loop with the real; whether it can revise its own categories, absorb alien signals,

and remain porous to novelty. A symbolic order that passes such tests may still one day fail them. The conditions that allow openness are themselves fragile and can be undermined by the very stability they foster. Thus, vigilance against lock-in must be continuous, not episodic.

One might ask whether it is possible to live entirely without the symbolic, to inhabit the real directly. In practical terms, the answer is no. Human cognition and social life are saturated with symbolic representation. But it is possible to design symbolic systems that are more resistant to lock-in. This requires embedding mechanisms for periodic disruption, such as ritualized doubt, institutionalized dissent, rotating leadership, and protected spaces for experimental thought. Such mechanisms do not eliminate the risk of entropy; they slow its onset by preventing the symbolic from becoming fully closed. The challenge is that these mechanisms are themselves symbolic and thus vulnerable to co-optation. A constitution may enshrine the principle of amendment, but if the interpretive culture ossifies, amendment becomes a dead letter.

Here we confront a paradox: *the symbolic is both the condition of human survival and the chief threat to it*. We cannot dispense with it, but we cannot wholly trust it. This paradox is not resolvable in the sense of being eliminable; it must be managed. Management, in this context, means cultivating a meta-symbolic awareness; a capacity to see symbols as provisional tools rather than ultimate realities. Philosophical traditions from East and West have gestured toward this awareness, whether in the Buddhist distinction between conventional and ultimate truth, or the pragmatic recognition that theories are instruments rather than mirrors of nature. Yet such insights rarely penetrate the operational core of political or economic systems, which are structurally incentivized to present their symbolic orders as final and self-justifying.

If we take seriously the idea that reality itself is engaged in a struggle against the symbolic, the historical task of humanity becomes clearer. It is not simply to extend life, comfort, or power, but to act as a steward of the coupling between symbol and real. To the extent that we succeed, we serve not only our own survival but the persistence of coherence in the wider field of existence. To the extent that we fail, we become agents of entropy, accelerating the

collapse of the very systems that sustain us. This is not a moralistic formulation but a structural one. The real does not care about our preferences, only about the viability of patterns.

In this framing, the recurrent crises of history, our revolutions, cultural upheavals, and paradigm shifts, are not aberrations but necessary interventions. They are moments when the real forces a recalibration of the symbolic, often violently, because the symbolic has resisted gentler forms of correction. The tragedy is that such recalibrations often overshoot, destroying not only the obsolete symbols but also the social and cognitive capacities that made symbolic coordination possible in the first place. The work of humanity, then, is not to side uncritically with either stability or disruption, but to understand the deeper rhythm in which both play a part.

Ultimately, to remember the real is to accept that our symbols will always fail us, and to live nonetheless in the tension between their necessity and their danger. The symbolic is the way the real becomes intelligible to itself through us; it is also the way the real can forget itself. In resisting lock-in, we resist not merely political or cultural stagnation but the entropy of existence itself. That resistance is fragile, endlessly compromised, and without final victory, but it is the only work worthy of a species that is, at bottom, reality walking on two legs.

References

James, B. (2025). *The Neurotypification of Society: Ego, Hype, and the Loss of Structural Reasoning*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTNO-8

James, B. (2025). *The Neurotypification of Society: Further Observations and Digressions*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTNO-9

James, B. (2025). *"Normal" in a Neurotypical World, or Mental Health in the Grip of the Symbolic Attractor*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMNIA

James, B. (2025). *Recursive Coherence: Foundations for an Adaptive Philosophy of Science, Mind, and Society*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMRCF